

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 14, 16-23 and 25-28 are pending in the present application. Claims 15 and 24 have been canceled. Claims 14, 16 and 23 have been amended and Claims 27 and 28 have been added by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 24 was objected to; Claims 14-16, 20 and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Wood (U.S. Patent 4,763,990) Claims 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Wood '990 in view of Chen et al.; Claims 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Wood '990 in view of Wood et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,582,389); and Claim 23 was indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. In light of this indication, new Claim 27 has been added that corresponds to original dependent Claim 13 rewritten in independent form.

Applicants also thank the Examiner for the courtesy of an interview extended to Applicants' representative on April 16, 2003. During the interview, the differences between the present invention and the applied art were discussed. In particular, Applicants' representative explained that according to Claim 14 an optical device for a helmet viewfinder includes an imager and an off-axis spherical concave mirror forming a first intermediate image and a diffractive field mirror situated in a vicinity of a second intermediate image reflected by the diffractive field mirror in which the vicinity has an extent limited to a maximum distance of the image beyond which resolution of the image at a center of a field of the device is degraded (similar to the subject matter recited in Claims 15 and 24, for example).

As discussed during the interview, Wood '990 only teaches a first intermediate image 54. This differs from the present invention as represented in a non-limiting example of Figure 3, in which a first intermediate image, 25 is formed and a second intermediate 27 is formed. Further, the diffractive mirror 21 is situated in a vicinity of the second intermediate image 27. Wood '990 does not teach or suggest the claimed first and second intermediate images nor the diffractive field mirror situated in the vicinity of the second intermediate image. Chen et al. and Wood et al. '389 also do not teach or suggest the claimed features.


Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent Claim 14 and each of the claims depending therefrom are also allowable.

Further, new Claim 28 has been added and depends on Claim 14. In particular, new Claim 28 recites that the diffractive field mirror is disposed so as to be antiparallel with the second intermediate image. This feature is shown in a non-limiting example in Figure 3 in which the diffraction field mirror 21 is disposed so as to be antiparallel with the second intermediate image 27. This differs from Wood et al. '990, for example, in which the diffractive field mirror 28 shown in Figure 2 is substantially parallel with the intermediate image 54. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted new Claim 24 further defines over the applied art.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER AND NEUSTADT, P.C.

  
Gregory J. Maier  
Registration No. 25,599  
Attorney of Record

David A. Bilodeau  
Registration No. 42,325



22850

Tel.: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413-2220  
GJM:DAB:bwt/mlm  
I:\ATTY\DAB\205507US-AM.DOC